

REMARKS AND INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On March 4, 2005, Applicants' attorney spoke with Examiner Hardee regarding the Office Action of January 25, 2005, as such Office action appeared to have a typographical error on Page 6, Item 11, line 1.

Examiner Hardee confirmed that the phrase "Claims 24, 29-34, 38-43 and 38" did contain a typographical error. Furthermore, Examiner Hardee then stated that:

- 1.) Claims 21-34 would be allowed if the limitation "processing said amine reaction product with a carrier to form a particle" were inserted into Claim 21. As amended Claim 21 contains the aforementioned limitation.
- 2.) Claims 36, 37 and 41-46 would be allowed if the double patenting rejections found in the January 25, 2005, Office action were overcome with a terminal disclaimer; and, for Claim 37, such claim was amended to depend from Claim 36. Applicants note that the applications that were the basis for the provisional double patenting rejections, USAPs 10/019,177 and 10/019,178, have granted as USPs 6,764,986 B1 and 6,740,713 B1. Thus an appropriate terminal disclaimer is included with this response and Claim 37 has been amended to depend from Claim 36.
- 3.) Claim 38 would be rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants note that Claim 38 was drafted as an independent claim. Thus such requirement has already been met.

Claims 21-34, 36-38 and 41-46 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 35, 39 and 40 have been canceled. Claims 1-20 were previously cancelled.

Claims 21, 29, 31, 33 and 37 have been amended.

Applicants contend that support for such amendments is found in the original claims and at pages 3, 4, 19, 23 and 24 of the specification.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of Applicants' amendments, remarks and the terminal disclaimer, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the double patenting rejection and rejections under 35 U.S.C §112, § 102 and § 103, and allow Claims 21-34, 36-38 and 41-46. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/019,179
Atty. Docket No. CM2174M
Amdt. Dated March 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2005
Customer No. 27752

Respectfully Submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By


Signature

Date: March 7, 2005
Customer No. 27752

James F. Mc Bride
Registration No. 43,784
(513) 627-0079